

Application Serial No. 10/583,485  
Amendment dated May 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated November 28, 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. This sheet, which includes Figure 3 only, replaces the original sheet including Figure 3 only. In Figure 3, previously omitted element "32" has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

By this response, claims 1-20 are pending. Claim 2 is amended, while all others remain as previously presented.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner has objected to an informality in claim 2. The claim has been amended to overcome this objection as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested. The Examiner has further objected to the drawings for failing to include a reference number. Figure 3 of the drawings has been amended to include the reference number and a replacement drawing sheet is presented herewith.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 844,288 to Purdy in view of U.S. Patent No. 538,895 to Casgrain. The '288 patent was issued in 1907 and the '895 patent was issued in 1895. Therefore, the individual teachings of both patents were disclosed over 100 years ago. Nonetheless, the combination in presently pending claims 1-20 is new in the art. Therefore, a long felt but unsolved need existed for the combination in presently pending claims 1-20. As the Supreme Court has stated, "[s]uch secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstance surrounding the origin of the subject

Application Serial No. 10/583,485  
Amendment dated May 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated November 28, 2007

matter sought to be patented.” *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) (emphasis added). The combination in presently pending claims 1-20 addresses the long felt but unsolved need for a “less bulky and relatively light” cable assembly and addresses “problems associated with slippage and creeping.” Thus, the combination in presently pending claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 20 is not believed to be obvious in view of the presently cited patents.

Moreover, the cited patent references do not teach all of the required elements of claim 2. Specifically, the references do not teach a wheel of a transmission mechanism “in the form of a sheave,” a “plurality of grooves formed in the outer peripheral surface thereof, the grooves communicating with cavities in the outer peripheral surfaces,” or a “plurality of cables each being associated with a respective groove and cavity” as required by claim 2. For these additional reasons, claim 2 is believed to distinguish over the cited prior art references.

The Examiner further states that the ‘895 patent discloses a wheel (A) with grooves (A<sup>x</sup>). However, in the ‘895 patent, the periphery of the sprocket wheel (A<sup>x</sup>) only contains holes or openings “to allow dust or dirt collecting on the exterior of the wheel to shake through, and thereby keep the periphery clean” and “alternate elevations and depressions in the periphery for the same purpose” (page 3, lines 66-75). The features of the ‘895 patent, which are simply designed “to allow dust or dirt collecting on the exterior

Application Serial No. 10/583,485  
Amendment dated May 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated November 28, 2007

of the wheel to shake through,” do not comprise a sheave. Thus, the ‘895 patent fails to teach a wheel of the transmission mechanism “in the form of a sheave” as required by claim 2. The ‘895 patent also fails to teach communication between the features it discloses, and therefore, fails to teach “grooves communicating with cavities in the outer peripheral surfaces” as required by claim 2. Finally, the ‘895 patent completely fails to teach a “plurality of cables each being associated with a respective groove and cavity” as also required by claim 2.

Next, the Examiner rejects claim 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over the ‘288 and ‘895 patents in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0023113 to Karnes, rejects claims 5, 13, 17, and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over the ‘288 and ‘895 patents in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0099508 to Larsen, and rejects claims 8, 9, 15, and 16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over the ‘288 and ‘895 patents in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0083607 to Campbell. Since claim 1 has been shown to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art references and each of these claims depend therefrom, dependent claims 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15-17 and 19 are likewise believed to be patentable.

In light of the above, the Applicant submits that all claims 1-20 are in a condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested. *To the extent any fees are due, although none are believed due, the undersigned authorizes their deduction from*

Application Serial No. 10/583,485  
Amendment dated May 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated November 28, 2007

*Deposit Account No. 11-0978.*

Respectfully submitted,

**KING & SCHICKLI, PLLC**



Michael S. Hargis

Registration No. 42,631

247 North Broadway  
Lexington, Kentucky 40507  
(859) 252-0889